

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks.

The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16, 35, and 43-46 are currently pending.
- Claims 2, 3, 11, 15, 17-34, and 36-42 were previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.
- Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 are amended herein.
- Claims 43-46 are added herein.

Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 and the subject matter recited in Claims 43-46 is found in the originally-filed specification in at least paragraphs [0023] – [0025], [0052], [0053], and [0058] – [0061]. No new matter is being introduced thereby.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the present Application:

- **Satomi:** Satomi et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0148327
- **John:** John et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088412
- **Alao:** Alao et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147645

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 16, and 35 are Non-Obvious over Satomi in view of John, in further view of Alao

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 16, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Satomi in view of John, in further view of Alao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1

For at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner-cited combination of Satomi, John, and Alao neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1, as amended:

reporting an exception encountered during processing of the third request, the third request including the log session ID and the third log ordering ID;

requesting log entries from a content server that generated the exception and that match the log session ID and requesting log entries from other content servers that processed requests that chronologically precede the exception and that match the log session ID; and

utilizing the log entries to generate an exception report that provides a context of the exception, the context including identifying a source of the exception and describing how to remedy the exception.

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing features are newly recited in independent Claim 1 and, therefore, amended Claim 1 has not been previously rejected. Moreover, Applicant further submits that the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao is completely silent with respect to the above recitations.

For instance, Satomi is directed to “a method for collecting only log information relating to specific processing from among a plurality of pieces of log information for integration” (Abstract). Moreover, John is directed to providing “loosely-coupled cluster systems comprising a plurality of servers based on storage attached to the plurality of servers” (Abstract) and the Examiner-cited portion of John further discloses that “requests are directed via load-balancing component **125**, shown as a Layer **4** switch in **FIG. 1**, to one of the servers in the cluster” (paragraph [0050]). Lastly, Alao is directed to “a method and apparatus for managing the presentation and regulation of E-Commerce, content and service providers access in an interactive television environment” including “interactions between a server, a client, and a service provider” (Abstract).

However, in view of the Examiner-cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that the above combination of references do not disclose or suggest the foregoing recitations. More particularly, Applicant submits that the above references do not disclose or suggest “reporting an exception,” “requesting log entries” relating to the exception, and “utilizing the log entries to generate an exception report” for “identifying a source of the exception and describing how to remedy the exception,” as presently recited in Claim 1. In fact, Applicant submits that the foregoing references simply fail to describe a situation in which an exception occurs. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Satomi, John, and Alao, both singularly and in combination with one another.

Independent Claims 16 and 35

Independent Claims 16 and 35 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1, which is patentable over the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 16 and 35 are also patentable over Satomi, John, and Alao both singularly and in combination with one another, for reasons similar to those set forth above.

Dependent Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46

As stated above, independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 are patentable over the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao. Accordingly, dependent Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35, as well as for the additional features that Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46 recite.

Claims 8, 10, and 12-14 are Non-Obvious over Satomi in view of Alao

Claims 8, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Satomi in view of Alao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claim 8 in the manner set forth above.

As stated above, independent Claim 8 is patentable over the combination of Satomi, John, and Alao for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 10 and 12-14 are also patentable over Satomi, John, and Alao, both singularly and in combination with one another, by virtue of their dependency on independent Claim 8, as well as for the additional features that Claims 10 and 12-14 recite.

Thus, Satomi, John, and Alao, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 8, 16, and 35 are patentable over the proposed combination of references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, and 43-46 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1 and 8, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16, 35, and 43-46 are not obvious over the various combinations of Satomi, John, and Alao, and therefore, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16, 35, 43-46 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and a notice of allowance.

The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action and because Applicant earnestly believed that the claims were in condition for allowance at the time of filing the previous response. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/
Brett J. Schlameus
(brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Dated: 2/2/2010

Reviewer: Kayla Brant
(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)
Registration No. 46576